

Highlights of the Theory*

Boris Z. Kopeliovich^{1,2} and Robert Peschanski³

¹ *Max-Planck-Institut für Kernphysik Postfach 30980, 69029 Heidelberg, Germany*

² *Joint Institute for Nuclear Research 141980 Moscow Region, Dubna, Russia*

³ *Service de Physique, CEA, CE-Saclay F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette France*

The highlights of the Working Group 5B, *Theory* are summarised. There has been reported impressive progresses in the study of BFKL Pomeron and Odderon dynamics. It turns out that the leading log approximation is not still a good one in the energy range of HERA and one should take care of next to leading corrections.

BFKL dynamics

New results on the BFKL dynamics presented at the session WG5B *Theory* initiated a hot discussion. Viktor Fadin reported his and Lev Lipatov's calculations for the next-to-leading correction (NLLA) to the leading-log approximation (LLA) completed recently^{1,2} (see also³). The main result is the kernel of the BFKL equation². Due to scale invariance the LLA kernel has a simple complete set of the eigenfunctions $(q_2^2)^{\frac{1}{2}+i\nu}$ with the largest eigenvalue $\omega_P^B = 4N_c \ln 2\alpha_s/\pi$ equal to the Pomeron intercept at the symmetric point $\nu = 0$. The argument of the running coupling is not fixed in this approximation.

The rough estimate of the influence of the (rather involved) correction to the kernel can be made similar in a way to the calculation of the bound-energy shift in nonrelativistic quantum mechanics, i.e. by taking the average value of a disturbance in a non-disturbed state. This naive estimate gives for the corrected intercept:

$$\omega_P \simeq \omega_P^B (1 - 2.4\omega_P^B). \quad (1)$$

The coefficient 2.4 does not look large. It fits with the rapidity interval where correlations, neglected at LLA, become important in particle production processes. This NLLA correction would be small if the LLA intercept ω_P^B were small. This is, unfortunately, not a case, and for $\omega_P^B = 0.4$ the two terms in brackets in (1) nearly cancel. It is worth noting, however, that, firstly, this estimate is quite straightforward and does not take into account neither

*Summary report on Working Group 5B, *Theory*, at DIS'98 Brussels, April 4-8, 1998

the influence of the running coupling on the eigenfunctions nor the nonperturbative effects; secondly, the value of the correction strongly depends on its presentation. For example, if one takes into account the NLLA correction by the corresponding increase of the argument of the running QCD coupling constant, ω_P at $\alpha_s(q^2) = 0.15$ turns out to be only twice smaller than its Born value. Another possibility which was mentioned during the discussion by Lev Lipatov is that the symmetric point $\nu = 0$ does not correspond anymore to the maximal eigenvalue of the kernel after the NLLA correction is included. Such a possibility is indeed realistic. It was shown in ⁴ that the symmetric point corresponds to the maximum only for very small α_s where the correction is also small, otherwise the maximal eigenvalue which determines the high energy behaviour occurs at a nonzero value of ν which depends on the coupling constant. The corresponding contribution to the cross section is sizable: for $\alpha_s \simeq 0.22$ it gives a Pomeron intercept $\omega_P = 0.2$ consistent with experimental data on diffractive deep-inelastic scattering.

At the moment the situation with the BFKL-based phenomenology seems to be confusing. This difficulty was stressed by Richard Ball during the following discussion. He presented his and Stefano Forte's results on NLLA corrections to anomalous dimensions which turn out to be enormous. Their pessimistic conclusion based on the failure of LLA is that there is no point to sum over powers of $\log(1/x)$ evolving the parton distributions, but one should try to develop a new approach. On contrary, Al Mueller was advocating the possibility of a resummation formula leading to a displaced but well-defined BFKL singularity. All in all, the need for a better conceptual understanding of the beautiful achievement of NLLA BFKL calculations was the major outcome of the lively discussion.

If abstracting from the problem of NLLA corrections, the BFKL Pomeron in the leading order is a sum of moving Regge poles and the most interesting is the rightmost one. Other poles, however, substantially affect the preasymptotic behaviour of the proton structure function in the kinematical region of HERA. A way to disentangle the leading pole contribution was suggested in the talk of Volodya Zoller. In the dipole impact parameter representation the subleading poles have nodes in dipole representation at $r_T \approx 0.5 - 1 \text{ fm}$. Therefore, the rightmost pole dominates the amplitude in this range of transverse separations. It is suggested that the charm structure function, which corresponds to interaction of a $c\bar{c}$ fluctuation of the virtual photon, is especially sensitive to this region of r_T and provides unique information about the leading energy dependence of the BFKL Regge poles. Vanishing contribution of the sub-leading BFKL poles at $Q^2 \leq 10 \text{ GeV}^2$ might have relevance to the deviation of $dF_2/d \log(Q^2)$ from the behaviour which follows from the evolu-

tion equations, the experimentally observed effect presented at this session by A. Caldwell.

However, all these results are obtained for the LLA BFKL and the importance of NLLA corrections make questionable their relevance to phenomenology.

We also note the derivation of an exact solution of the BFKL equation in *three* dimensions by Dimitri Ivanov reporting calculations with Lev Lipatov and co-workers. Similarities and differences with the four-dimensional case were discussed.

The Odderon intercept

A generalization of the BFKL equation for the Pomeron intercept

$$E \Phi = H_{12} \Phi , \quad (2)$$

where $\Phi \propto s^\Delta$, $\Delta = -g^2 N_c E_{min}/8\pi^2 = (g^2/\pi^2) N_c \ln 2$, is the BKP (Bartels-Kwiecinski-Praszalowicz) equation for a multi-gluon exchange,

$$E \Phi(k_1, \dots, k_n) = \sum_{i < k} H_{ik} \frac{T_i^a T_k^a}{(-N_c)} \Phi , \quad (3)$$

where T_i^a are the generators of $SU(N_c)$ group acting on the gluon color indexes i . A solution of the BKP equation could settle the problem of unitarization of the BFKL Pomeron (a generalized "eikonalization"). In analogy to the conformal $SL(2, C)$ invariance which helps to solve the BFKL equation, one should look for symmetries of the BKP equation. A duality symmetry of Reggeon interactions, similar to the famous electric-magnetic duality of gauge field theories, in was discussed by Lev Lipatov in his talk.

Being an extension to many gluon channels of the two-gluon BFKL equation, the BKP also contains a solution with negative C -parity in t -channel, a so called Odderon. The minimal number of exchanged interacting gluons is three. A solution for the BKP and for the Odderon intercept was presented by Romuald Janik. The result turns out to be negative,

$$\omega_O = -0.16606 \frac{3\alpha_s N_c}{2\pi} \quad (4)$$

The Odderon can contribute to nucleon-nucleon elastic scattering, $K_L \rightarrow K_S$ regeneration, etc. Eq. (4) predicts decreasing energy dependence for such a contribution. Since the Odderon amplitude is mostly real a good chance to detect it is the interference with the real part of the Pomeron amplitude in

the vicinity of the minimum in the differential cross section of NN elastic scattering at $|t| \approx 1.3 - 1.5 \text{ GeV}^2$. Such an interference has different signs for pp and $\bar{p}p$ scattering and can explain the observed difference between ISR and $SppS$ results. However, besides the Odderon intercept one needs to know the t -dependence. Therefore, it seems to be problematic to find an observable manifestation of (4), at least for the time being.

Renormalization Group and Fracture Functions

In the better-known and fruitful domain of the Renormalization Group properties of QCD, Massimo Grazzini reported the progress made in the derivation of evolution equations for the *Fracture Functions*. Fracture Functions are one-particle inclusive observables which correspond to a mixture of both structure and fragmentation functions. They give the probability $M(x_{Bj}, x_{Fey}, Q^2)$ of finding a hadron with a certain Feynman fraction x_{Fey} of outgoing momentum once there has been a deep-inelastic interaction of a quark with Bjorken fraction x_{Bj} of ingoing momentum on a virtual photon of virtuality Q^2 . Besides the interest of joining two great men in the same observable, fracture functions have the property of obeying evolution equations dictated by perturbative QCD and the renormalization Group.

The new point put forward by Grazzini is the elucidation of a puzzle about these evolution equations. While the original $M(x_{Bj}, x_{Fey}, Q^2)$ is driven by quite non-standard evolution equations with an inhomogeneous term, it was shown that the more differential $M(x_{Bj}, x_{Fey}, Q^2; t)$, where t is the momentum-squared transferred to the proton target, follows standard DGLAP renormalization Group equations at leading order.

For the future, interesting questions remain such that higher-order corrections or the applicability of the formalism to rapidity-gap events which are experimentally relevant at HERA.

Acknowledgements

We are particularly grateful to all the participants for the lively discussions which lasted much later than foreseen, and to the organizers who patiently waited till the end of the session. Al Mueller was of precious help for mastering beautifully the discussion and, in particular for asking the first questions to the brave experimentalists present in the audience. Thanks to all!

One of us (R.P.) signals that this work was supported in part by the EU Fourth Framework Programme ‘Training and Mobility of Researchers’, Network ‘Quantum Chromodynamics and the Deep Structure of Elementary Particles’, contract FMRX-CT98-0194 (DG 12 - MIHT). Another one’s (B.Z.K.)

work was partially supported by European Network: Hadronic Physics with Electromagnetic Probes, No FMRX CT96-0008, and by INTAS grant No 93-0239.

References

1. V. S. Fadin and L. N. Lipatov, hep-ph/9802290
2. V. S. Fadin, this Conference
3. Marcello Ciafaloni and Gianni Camici, hep-ph/9803389
4. D.A. Ross, hep-ph/9804332